DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 204 JC 760 133

TITLE	Task Force on Board Relationships. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia.
PUB DATE	7 Jan 76
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Administrative Problems; *Administrator Responsibility; *College Administration; Community Colleges; Educational Responsibility; Governance; *Junior Colleges; *State Boards of Education; State Legislation; State School District Relationship; *Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington

ABSTRACT

The governance and management of the community college system in the state of Washington is based upon a division of responsibilities between the 22 district boards of trustees and the State Board. In 1967, a formal division of responsibilities between the district boards and the State Board was enacted by the state legislature. Later reports of district and State Board activities divided these responsibilities into 10 problem areas: (1) operating budget actions; (2) capital budget and project actions; (3) personnel actions, including professional negotiations; (4) real property acquisitions; (5) program and curriculum-related actions; (6) planning; (7) fees and charges; (8) legislative program; (9) State agency status; (10) multi-district cooperation. This report reassesses district and State Board responsibilities in each of these 10 areas, and makes a number of recommendations. A matrix graph is appended which explains the statutory responsibilities of each of the boards, enumerates recommendations, explains the implications of the recommendations for board responsibilities, and delineates the steps necessary for implementation. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118204

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TASK FORCE ON BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

Final Report

State Board for Community College Education
319 Seventh Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98504

January 7, 1976

JC 760 133

TASK FORCE ON BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

MEMBERS

Trustees

C.W. Duffy, Trustee
District No. 8
Bellevue Community College

Robert G. Leonard, Trustee
District No. 7
Shoreline Community College

Merilynn Wilson, Trustee
District No. 15
Wenatchee Valley College

Lawrence Weinstein, Trustee
District No. 2
Grays Harbor College

State Board

Andrew J. Young, Chairman
Chairman, State Board
Seventh Congressional District

Louis Soriano
Member, State Board
Sixth Congressional District

Ruth Shepherd
Past-Member, State Board

L. Evert Landon
Past-Member, State Board

RESOURCE PEOPLE

Presidents

Orville D. Carnahan, President
Highline College
District No. 9

Marion O. Oppelt, President
Fort Steilacoom Community College
District No. 11

David B. Story, President
Lower Columbia College
District No. 13

State Board Staff

John C. Mundt, Director and
Secretary to the State Board

John N. Terrey
Associate Director
Administrative Services

Roger J. Bassett
Assistant Director, Planning

Task Force on Board Relationships

FINAL REPORT

I N D E X

		Page No.
I.	SUMMARY STATEMENT	1
II.	DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	A. Task Force Process	1
	B. Ten Areas of Concern	
	1. Operating budget actions	2
	2. Capital budget and project actions	4
	3. Personnel actions, including professional negotiations	6
	4. Real property acquisitions	8
	5. Program and curriculum-related actions	9
	6. Planning	11
	7. Fees and charges	13
	8. Legislative program	14
	9. State agency status	15
	10. Multi-district cooperation	16
III.	SUMMARY	17

APPENDICES:

I. Responsibility Matrix

II. Charge to the Task Force

III. Discussion of local levies as an alternative to state funding

IV. Discussion of capital budget development process

V. References

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The governance and management of the community college system is based upon a division of responsibilities between district boards of trustees and the State Board; however, the decisions made should be consistent with policies adopted by the Legislature. The inevitable tensions created by this division of responsibilities and by the state/district interactions necessary to carry them out are an acceptable consequence, given the importance of sustained state-level financial support and locally-based program and operational decisions.

Under these circumstances, a balance of responsibilities between the State Board and district boards is acceptable and desirable. It is the primary role of the State Board to influence state government policy-making to the end that state government management decisions for community colleges are based upon desirable and feasible policies and upon local district requirements. One of these policies should be that community college education should be responsible to the public, i.e., accountable to state government for funds and results, and to the community for operating and related management decisions.

It is the responsibility of the district boards to operate in a way which recognizes local community needs and reconciles those needs to state-level resources and constraints. Community college districts are local agencies which should have a maximum degree of autonomy for the purposes of the services they provide so that the needs of students and the community can be met. They are state agencies in terms of their funding and accountability. While the business of meeting local educational needs is the proper responsibility of district boards, the policies, rules and regulations associated with state funding are the proper responsibility of the State Board.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Task Force Process

During its July 1974 meeting, the task force received a summary of actions taken by the State Board during the 1973-74 fiscal year. The report was presented in ten categories which were derived from the categories used at the time in publishing and distributing the State Board agenda. These became the categories within which problem areas were discussed and recommendations were made.

Also at the July meeting, the 1973-74 board actions from two typical district boards were discussed and displayed in the same ten categories. (A summary of these analyses is not a part of this report but is available from the State Board for Community College Education and is listed in Appendix V, references.)

The members of the task force then discussed each category on the basis of experience and the extent to which it was considered to be a problem. Recommendations were formed at the conclusion of the discussions on each area.

1. Operating Budget Actions

The State Board must continue its efforts to provide continuing flexibility for local district operating budget procedures and expenditures, and its efforts to resist line-item modifications of community college budgets.

Second, the budget formulas which have been used by the community college system to generate budget requests for the past several years do a good job under current circumstances but do not adequately justify community college needs in terms that influence a majority of the decision-makers in the executive and legislative branches.

Third, many of the operating budget problems faced by the districts can be traced back to the conflict between limited state-level revenue and continuing strong program demands. Alternative sources of revenue is one way to relieve some of the pressure.

New sources of funds are attractive, since authority usually follows the source of funds. In other words, if additional funding needs of the community colleges can be met through new sources of local funds, then what some see as a trend towards centralization in the system would at least be moderated.

There are virtues associated with local funding. First, it provides some possibility of increased total funding for community colleges. That is, it does not compete with other state sources and so might be more attractive to state legislators.

Second, the authority and discretion that goes with local funding could serve to offset what seems to some to be an increasing momentum towards state control, usually justified on the basis of the strings attached to state funding.

Third, local funding would strengthen the district negotiations process by better relating district budget needs to sources of community support. If part of the district budget depends on the support of the community, then both sides to the negotiations process will be more aware of the wishes and needs of the local community.

The task force does not expect immediate relief to revenue problems through new sources of funds. In order to gain access to them, we must (1) successfully convince the State Legislature to authorize new taxes or to grant community college districts a share of an existing tax; (2) convince the State Legislature not to offset the new local revenues when they make state appropriations; and (3) successfully address the arguments now being presented in favor of local levy relief for school districts. It would be difficult to argue for local levies before the Legislature at a time when major pressures are being mounted in favor of relief from them.

There are also some procedural concerns. Some boundary changes would be necessary in order for community college districts to make sense as taxing districts. Also, unless a community college district levy proposal would require only a simple majority for passage, we would be subject to many of the same difficulties that have caused local school districts to seek levy relief.

Two outside resource people were invited to discuss the issue of local levies with the task force. Dr. Ray Needham, President of Linn-Benton Community College in Oregon, argued in support of local levy funding. Dr. Ray Schultz, Professor of Community College Education at Washington State University, argued in support of continued full state funding. Their comments appear as Appendix III.

The task force decided not to recommend that districts be authorized to seek local levies. It did adopt the following other recommendations to guide future operating budget matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS - OPERATING BUDGET ACTIONS

1. *The district boards shall establish, adopt and regularly update an annual budget for district operations, just as the State Board develops the system budget.*

Rationale: While the broad state budget and accounting act requires each state agency to maintain an annual budget in conformance to OPPFM-prescribed formats and rules, the task force felt that this responsibility of district boards should be more clearly spelled out and perhaps contained in the Community College Act itself. A balance of budgetary responsibility is crucial to a balance of governance responsibility in the system.

2. *The State Board and district boards should resist line-items in operating budget appropriations and allocations by either the Legislature or the State Board.*

Rationale: The task force concluded that many of the restrictions on district operations, and much of the movement towards centralization within the system, originate with line-item provisos in appropriation bills. There was also a feeling that the State Board should be conservative in its use of earmarked allocations to implement system-wide policies.

3. *District efforts to gain operating budget support from the Legislature shall be made only through the system budget request process. The proposed system budget should identify the impact on each individual district at various support levels.*

Rationale: The notion of system discipline in connection with the legislative effort has been a part of our legislative strategy for several years. This simply reinforces the importance of that discipline in connection with the operating and capital budgets.

4. *The State Board shall decide the system budget request and district allocations only after adequate advance notice to the districts and after providing an opportunity for interested districts to be heard. This notice procedure will ordinarily be through the WACC Operating Budget Committee. The minutes of the WACC Operating Budget Committee should be prepared and distributed to all presidents and chairpersons of district boards in order to provide for wider involvement in the budget building process.*

Rationale: The district trustees on the task force feel they receive inadequate information about the overall budget request strategy and allocations. By the time they see it, state-level decisions have already been made and the document is more a matter of information to them than anything else. This recommendation would increase the role of the district trustees in both the budget request and allocation processes. Also, it places a responsibility on the WACC Operating Budget Committee to make sure that the trustees' concerns are satisfied.

2. Capital Budget and Project Actions

The main issue here is the perceived lack of involvement of districts in the priority and other decisions involved in presenting the system capital budget request to the Legislature. Trustees feel that while district boards have input to the Capital Analysis Model, it is the assumptions and conditions of the CAM that determine final recommendations to the State Board, and, therefore, the State Board's recommendations to the Legislature.

There is certainly a need for uniform rules to assure equitable allocation of resources among districts. But districts need more flexibility in the exact projects to which the resources will be committed. The current CAM process can be described as one end of the flexibility spectrum; a local capital bond issue process as the other. Some choices are needed in the middle. The task force considered three options for change in the current process:

1. A process to allow districts access to a local capital bond issue, with the proceeds of a successful bond issue to be charged against the CAM entitlement for the district.

2. An annual capital dollar allowance for each district so that each district can decide how long to accumulate the allowance and to what type and size of capital project to commit it.

3. The present CAM process, with improvements to increase the impact of district recommendations and priorities.

The task force recommended a combination of options 2 and 3--a lump-sum capital appropriation (no legislative earmarking of projects) to the State Board, with district capital allocations according to internal system allocation rules similar to those we now use. The space requirements and cost standards used in that allocation process should be revised to better reflect total space needs and the need for improving the quality of space on some campuses. Also, the manner in which project priorities are set should be made

more visible and objective and more responsive to district needs as determined by the district boards. A summary of the discussion leading to the task force recommendation, including an analysis of all three alternatives by Mr. William Julius, State Board Capital Budget Officer, is Appendix IV.

The recommendation regarding a lump-sum capital appropriation and four others adopted by the task force follow:

RECOMMENDATIONS - CAPITAL BUDGET AND PROJECT ACTIONS

5. *The State Board should request that the capital appropriation be made by the Legislature in a lump-sum to the State Board for distribution among district projects according to internal system allocation rules. The State Board must provide the executive and legislative branches with evidence assuring accountability at both the state and local levels of the system.*

Rationale: Such a process would take some of the politics out of the decision process. OPPFM and others would not get into the project-by-project detail.

Also, it would allow us to better manage our cash flow and probably develop more capital dollars for the system, primarily because there would be a better link between capital decisions and money management than is possible when so much of the decision rests with OPPFM and legislative analysts.

Such a process would reduce the extent to which executive and legislative staff people duplicate the work that has already been done within the community college system.

Most of all, such a lump-sum process would discourage internal district game-playing in the process of building a request.

Specific decision rules and changes needed to make them viable were left to later staff work with the understanding that should this recommendation be implemented, development of such rules would involve district personnel.

6. *The use of the Capital Analysis Model (CAM) in the capital budget development process must be modified to assure maximum local involvement.*

Rationale: The capital budget development system, including the CAM, serves an important purpose ... the analysis of district capital projects against common standards, and the display of all projects in a prioritized list that reflects selected cost and policy assumptions.

However, many district boards feel that the state-level capital budget development process--and the CAM in particular--so outweighs district priority and design decisions that the district board's role in capital budget development is insufficient.

This recommendation calls for a review of the capital budget development process to increase the impact of district board priority and design decisions.

7. *The State Board's internal system capital allocation should recognize campus master plans and priorities.*

Rationale: Some districts invest substantial amounts of funds in comprehensive campus master plans, with emphasis on total campus needs and layout. The capital budget system used by the State Board should better recognize the recommendations and direction of such campus master plans as they address the total space needs for the districts.

8. *District efforts to gain capital budget support from the Legislature shall be made only through the system budget request process.*

Rationale: The rationale for this recommendation is the same as for a similar recommendation under operating budget actions (see Recommendation No. 3).

3. Personnel Actions, Including Professional Negotiations

The key issue in this area is the role of the State Board in the district negotiations process. While State Board interference in district negotiations has been minimal, there does seem to be an unmistakable trend towards further State Board involvement--a possible encroachment upon district board authority.

Technical improvements, like the MIS, make it easier for state-level agencies to involve themselves in district management decisions. The Legislature has done more to influence State Board/district board responsibilities than has any other agency or factor. The question is what can we do to influence the trend in a direction that will allow more district board and State Board flexibility?

It is a proper State Board responsibility to interpret legislative intent and to distribute such interpretations to the districts. The actions of the State Board during the last fiscal year have been an exercise of that responsibility, rather than an attempt by the State Board to exercise the full range of responsibilities spelled out in the Greenwood case.

The specific recommendations adopted by the task force in the area of personnel actions and professional negotiations follow:

RECOMMENDATIONS - PERSONNEL ACTIONS, INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

9. *District boards should conduct local negotiations on salary and other negotiable items in accordance with legislative intent.*

Rationale: This recommendation is intended to identify professional negotiations as a district board responsibility and to recognize that legislative intent must always be a factor in those negotiations, whether or not it is implemented through the State Board.

10. *The State Board shall determine legislative intent.*

Rationale: This recommendation implements the consensus of the task force regarding the State Board's role in determining legislative intent and distributing it to the districts.

11. *The task force endorses the concept of removing the State Board from the professional negotiations process, including impasse procedures.*

Rationale: This recommendation is consistent with legislation recommended by the community college presidents and trustees and is acceptable to the State Board and Director. The effect of it would be to significantly reduce the involvement of the State Board in professional negotiations.

12. *The State Board should not establish a statewide salary schedule. If it becomes necessary for the State Board to act in response to a district salary increase which is beyond what the State Board believes proper under the circumstances of a legislative appropriation, the State Board will act to protect the integrity of the legislative appropriation. The State Board has responsibility to assist in the elimination of excessive salary disparities.*

Rationale: This recommendation is intended to limit the role of the State Board in salary management to the interpretation of legislative intent on salary matters and, within that limitation, to describe the State Board's role in the resolution of excessive salary disparities among district salary schedules.

13. *It should be the responsibility of the Office of the Attorney General to resolve any differences among opinions rendered by Assistant Attorneys General.*

Rationale: In matters that involve many district boards and the State Board on decisions of a similar nature--like the latitude allowed for salary negotiations--consistency of opinion among the various Attorneys General is very important. Even if a decision in one district did not influence a decision in another, consistency would be needed between advice to the State Board and advice to any one district board. This recommendation applies to all matters that require legal advice ... not just to personnel matters.

14. *The Office of the Attorney General should provide copies of all legal interpretations and a summary of pending legal issues to the State Board, and the State Board should distribute summaries of same to the districts.*

Rationale: This is a further implementation of the point made under Recommendation No. 13 above. The Education Division of the Office of the Attorney General is already implementing this recommendation.

4. Real Property Acquisitions

The main issue here is the latitude allowed district boards to accept gifts without some form of offset in the allocation of state operating and capital funds.

The state agency status of community college districts makes many local donors uneasy. They want the gift to go to their local college, not to the state. Local boards should be able to hold title and receive the benefits of gifts of both real and personal property. Prior to acceptance of such gifts or benefits, the local district should advise the State Board of the pending acquisition. The State Board should be able to receive gifts on behalf of the entire system.

On a related matter, the task force endorsed the State Board's role in review and approval of district leases. This is an appropriate, continuing role of the State Board because: (1) rental payments are fully-funded items within the budget formulas; and (2) state staff expertise often uncovers unnecessarily high rent costs.

The recommendations implementing task force conclusions regarding gifts of real and personal property are as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS - REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

15. *District boards shall hold title to all real and personal property received as gifts from private sources (and income from such gifts of real and personal property), consistent with the terms of the gift, and shall have authority to convey and sell it. If sold, the proceeds from the sale of gifts of real property must be reappropriated by the Legislature in order to remain the property of the district board. Proceeds from the sale of gifts of personal property shall remain the property of the district.*

Rationale: Gifts of real and personal property to community colleges properly belong to the districts, and control over such proceeds should be exclusively in the hands of the districts.

16. *Prior to acceptance of such gifts or benefits, the district board shall advise the State Board of the pending acquisition.*

Rationale: This recommendation is not intended as a limitation on the districts, but as an assistance to districts in the evaluation of the value and consequences of a proposed gift.

17. *The State Board shall not reduce support to a district because of gifts or their value.*

Rationale: This recommendation is intended to discourage any State Board action reducing either an operating or capital budget allocation by the amount of a gift.

18. *The task force supports the efforts of the State Board to obtain authority to receive gifts on behalf of the system as a whole.*

Rationale: This recommendation distinguishes gifts to district boards from gifts to the system as a whole and endorses the notion of the State Board receiving gifts for the system as a whole.

5. Program and Curriculum-Related Actions

No major areas of conflict or disagreement were identified in this area. Program and curriculum are the areas best spelled out in the Community College Act, and the State Board has been cautious in implementing its responsibilities in this area to avoid major areas of conflict.

The recommendations that follow serve mainly to highlight and reinforce community college initiatives that are already underway.

RECOMMENDATIONS - PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM-RELATED ACTIONS

19. *To assure thoroughly comprehensive educational and training programs among districts of varying size, appropriate adjustments should be part of the rules for allocating operating resources to the districts.*

Rationale: This recommendation reflects legislative debate on the subject of "comprehensiveness" during the 1975 legislative session. The issue is the difficulty that districts have offering a full range of courses, particularly the more expensive vocational courses and the second year of many college transfer majors.

20. *District boards are supportive of community service courses and expect the State Board to make every effort to secure funding for them.*

Rationale: This recommendation reflects task force conclusions (1) that community service offerings are an important part of district program plans, and (2) that responsibility for seeking necessary state funding for them rests with the State Board.

21. *District program staffing levels shall be the responsibility of the districts.*

Rationale: This recommendation recognizes recent legislative proposals to place limits on staffing levels as a way of controlling community college expenditures. The recommendation discourages legislative or state agency involvement in district-level staffing decisions.

22. *The State Board has responsibility for supervising and enforcing enrollment counting criteria for budget purposes.*

Rationale: The task force had a brief discussion about how enrollments are reported and the extent to which the counting of enrollments is important for budgetary purposes. The purpose of this recommendation is to tie down a current practice which is not explicitly spelled out in the Community College Act.

23. *The State Board shall have responsibility to review course coding and credit hours assigned to courses and to recommend the changes necessary to establish minimum uniformity among districts.*

Rationale: Two enrollment counting issues have continually bothered community college attempts to achieve better budgetary support from the Legislature. First, courses which appear to be similar in nature are sometimes assigned different credit-hour values by different districts. Second, the manner in which courses are coded (academic versus vocational, for example) directly affects funding and is not done in a completely uniform manner by all districts.

These practices are unacceptable to both districts and outside agencies, since they raise questions about the equity of distribution of funds to the system and among the various districts. This recommendation reflects the feeling of the task force that the issue is so complex and sensitive that several backgrounds and points of view are needed to satisfactorily resolve it.

A task force of district instructional program leaders, under the leadership of Dr. Frank Price of the State Board staff, is already working on this matter. They expect to develop recommendations during 1975-76.

24. *The task force subscribes to the consortium concept as presented in the "multi-district cooperation" section of this report.*

Rationale: This recommendation reflects the task force's preference for tackling multi-district program problems through multi-district cooperation rather than through the establishment of new regional governing units.

6. Planning

Two areas came up for significant discussion. First, the manner in which system-level planning is presented for local district review and reaction needs review. Local boards of trustees feel that by the time they see system-level plans, it is too late to do anything about them. There needs to be a more sensitive process for involving district boards in system-wide planning.

Second, the State Board cannot assume that districts have limited resources with which to plan. The districts usually have too few staff resources to satisfy all state-level initiatives, so they must choose which can be done with limited time. If district planning and state planning can be made more consistent (can be accomplished with the same effort), then districts would not have to make those choices.

Following are the recommendations made by the task force with regard to planning:

RECOMMENDATIONS - PLANNINC

25. *State and district boards should jointly develop the program planning techniques necessary to meet the requirements of the program budget request process that will commence with the 1977-79 biennium.*

Rationale: According to OPPFM, program budgeting will guide the 1977-79 budget process. (The Program Decision System [PDS] concept is OPPFM's approach to program budgeting.) Even if OPPFM was not calling for program budgeting, a program orientation is the next logical step in the development of community college operating and capital budget requests and the allocation of appropriated funds internally in the system. For both these reasons, the process for developing a program-oriented budget request for 1977-79 is underway.

26. *The State Board should coordinate the development of efficiency and effectiveness measures with widespread system input from faculty and administrators and in consultation with third-party agencies.*

Rationale: This recommendation recognizes recent legislative and executive branch pressure on all state agencies to introduce program budgeting (including standards with which to measure budgetary needs) into 1977-79 budget requests. WACC (the community college presidents' organization) has stressed the importance of this effort and has urged the emphasis on widespread system input and consultation with third-party agencies.

27. *The State and district boards must constantly affirm their belief in the open door concept and seek the funding support necessary to sustain it.*

    The State Board is responsible for presenting an enrollment plan to the Governor and the Legislature that, if accepted, would sustain the open door. The State Board is also responsible for establishing district-by-district enrollment plans that recognize and protect (to the extent possible within the terms of a given appropriation) the program differences and per-student cost differences that exist among the districts.

    The district board's responsibility is to adopt admissions and enrollment policies that achieve the best balance between growth and program that is possible within a given budget.

Rationale: Responsibility for setting enrollment policies, at whatever level within the system, should carry with it an obligation to constantly affirm the concept of the open door.

The State Board's responsibility is to prepare and present an enrollment plan that achieves the fastest justifiable growth rate with appropriate per-student support levels for all districts.

The district board's responsibility is to adopt admissions and enrollment policies that achieve the best balance between growth and program that is possible within a given budget.

Conflicts between perceived local and state-level growth/per-student support decisions can then be discussed within the enrollment planning process and presented as a part of the next scheduled executive and legislative review of state agency budgets.

28. *State Board planning procedures should provide for involvement of district personnel. District planning which cuts across district boundaries should be shared with the State Board.*

Rationale: District boards of trustees too often are not involved in major state-level planning decisions until after those decisions have been made. Also, local planning should be shared with the State Board so that local directions can be known prior to the time state-level decisions are made.

7. Fees and Charges

The task force concern here was not the fees themselves but the authority of the State Board to guide or control district fee policies. Past State Board actions on charges and uses of student services and activities fees have had the effect of regulation in many districts, and some task force members questioned that as a proper role of the State Board.

The State Board, as the supervising agency in the system, has the right to issue guidelines, but guidelines are not binding upon district boards. Other educational agencies, including the State Board of Education, have used guidelines to good effect by presenting them as standards which become operational only if accepted and implemented by district boards.

The task force concluded that the State Board should allow maximum latitude for district boards in all areas of fees and should act to regulate fee practices only where uniformity is clearly required in order to serve the needs of the system as a whole. Also, there should be a clear distinction among guidelines, rules and regulations if State Board actions are to be accurately interpreted and implemented by the district boards.

Following are the recommendations made by the task force with regard to fees and charges:

RECOMMENDATIONS - FEES AND CHARGES

29. *The authority to set fee schedules belongs exclusively to the local boards; however, the State Board should establish guidelines encouraging uniform charges among the districts for the various tuition and fee categories.*

Rationale: The authority to set fee schedules belongs exclusively to the local boards. However, uniformity of fee charges among districts is important and is best accomplished through State Board guidelines that take effect only if adopted by local boards.

30. *Guidelines, rules and regulations should be defined as three separate and distinct categories of State Board actions so that they can be accurately interpreted and implemented by district boards.*

Rationale: Considerable confusion existed among districts over the extent of authority behind the so-called student services and activities fee guidelines. A guideline is not binding on district boards; a rule or regulation is binding. A clear definition and use of each separate category would resolve such confusion in the future.

8. Legislative Program

There was some general discussion about how the community college system can develop additional legislative influence. Most agree that the legislative power base for community colleges is in the districts, but some districts have only a few legislators and others have more than can be regularly and effectively contacted. While we have been successful on key issues, we may not always be able to sustain the kind of peak effort that has been necessary to win those issues. We need more consistency and an organization that will support our effort over a longer period of time.

Restrictions on community college lobbying are more stringent that those applicable to some other state agencies. This difference in lobbying opportunities is a major constraint on the legislative effectiveness of community colleges.

Following are the recommendations made by the task force with regard to the legislative program of the community colleges:

RECOMMENDATIONS - LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

31. State and district community college boards should have the authority to communicate with the Legislature.

Rationale: In the absence of any reason to discriminate against community colleges, community college district boards and the State Board should be given as much authority to lobby as is now granted to some other state agencies.

32. The task force endorses the concept of a United Legislative Council.

Rationale: The United Legislative Council is a system-level group through which certain legislative positions, common to all elements of the system, are identified and endorsed. The following groups are represented on the council: State Board for Community College Education; Trustees Association of Community Colleges; Washington Association of Community Colleges (community college presidents); Association of Higher Education (community college faculty); Washington Federation of Teachers; Council of Representatives and Presidents (community college students); Washington State Employees Association; and Washington Federation of State Employees Council.

Among other duties, the council endorses the Community College United Legislative Program and reviews legislative issues and proposed legislation on a weekly basis during legislative sessions.

Since the United Legislative Council was not mentioned in law, it seemed important to endorse it and the role it plays in developing the legislative program of the community college system in this report.

33. *The United Legislative Council should continue to develop a representative legislative program for community colleges.*

Rationale: Same as Recommendation No. 32 above.

It is important to note that each member on the council is bound only to positions endorsed by all groups represented on the council.

If a group fails in its attempt to get unanimous United Legislative Council endorsement, it is free to pursue the matter on its own, directly with the Legislature.

9. State Agency Status

Frequent reference is made to various costly and limiting procedures associated with state agency status. These are particularly visible in the community colleges which have been state agencies only since the 1967 Community College Act was passed. Many of the desirable local operating prerogatives available to school districts were given up as state agency procedures were initiated. Examples are the extensive data reporting required in connection with the state budgeting process; the extra costs of Higher Education Personnel Board salary scales versus local salary scales; the regulations associated with the use of state and private automobiles; the costs of unemployment compensation; the costs of honoring purchasing regulations; state printing costs; and the requirements associated with capital project development according to state standards, rather than according to local standards.

Community college districts are separate state agencies with some direct obligations to various state-level regulatory agencies on the one hand, and are local districts with obligations to the State Board on the other. These two obligations are occasionally in conflict.

There are few precedents for state agencies to be exempted from these kinds of costs and controls. In most cases, the alternative would be to establish a state-level community college staff to perform the regulatory and other functions now performed by other state agencies.

Most members of the task force felt that the loss of district autonomy to the State Board under such an arrangement would more than offset the gains realized by the districts by being out from under the requirements of other state agencies.

Following are the recommendations made by the task force with regard to state agency status:

RECOMMENDATIONS - STATE AGENCY STATUS

34. *The state office should (a) determine the cost of those reporting requirements associated with state agency status, and (b) request and allocate funds to reimburse the districts for the costs.*

Rationale: Few state regulatory agencies realize how much their requirements cost local community college districts and the system. In the absence of such a realization, additional requirements are levied each year without a proportionate increase in administration budgets to bear the costs. This recommendation would establish those costs and then formalize them as a budget request at the appropriate time and in the appropriate way.

35. *All data requests from agencies such as CPE, OPPFM and the Legislature should be channeled through the state office.*

Rationale: If the state office acts as a clearinghouse for all data requests, some of them will be screened off and/or combined with others with a corresponding reduction in the total data load.

10. Multi-District Cooperation

There are occasional suggestions that the governance of the community colleges would be improved if regional governing boards were established, particularly in areas now served by several small community college districts.

The task force feels that the use of program or project-related consortia accomplishes the economies of scale possible through multi-district cooperation without establishing an additional governance layer in the system.

Also, the task force encourages state and local board members to attend each others' meetings as frequently as possible. This could be a way of facilitating communication between the two boards short of the establishment of regional governing boards. One approach would be for State Board members to attend the district board meetings of their Congressional district. One problem with such an arrangement is the possibility that State Board members might develop a provincial view toward their discussion of State Board business.

On the basis of the above concerns regarding multi-district cooperation, the task force adopted the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS - MULTI-DISTRICT COOPERATION

36. *The task force does not favor establishment of regional boards.*

Rationale: Other means of multi-district cooperation are available short of the establishment of regional boards. Regional boards bring another level of governance and delay into the decision process. They also involve additional administrative costs. This recommendation is an endorsement of the vitality of district boards and of the ability of the State Board to work effectively without an intermediate governing level.

37. *The State Board should encourage the establishment of consortia in order to promote economies, promote specialized programs and services for students, and avoid duplication. Districts should keep the State Board advised of existing and proposed consortia efforts.*

Rationale: A variety of consortia have been established during the last three or four years to deal with various multi-district program opportunities. They have served as an effective way to achieve economies in special programs and to avoid duplication of programs in program areas where one district can serve a multi-district area. On the basis of these successes, the consortium approach seems to be preferable to the establishment of new governing units and levels of review.

SUMMARY

The task force concludes that the balance of responsibilities between the State Board and the twenty-two district boards—provided for in 1967—is still a workable structure. The recommendations of the task force, summarized in matrix form in Appendix I, contain a variety of procedural recommendations that will facilitate this balance of responsibilities.

So that this report can remain viable, the task force recommends that a two-person committee be designated to supervise the implementation of all recommendations and to facilitate the resolution of new State Board/local board issues as they arise. The committee should consist of the Chairperson of the State Board or designee and the President of the Trustees Association of Community Colleges or designee. It should be convened by the State Board member whenever either member feels the need to do so. The first report of progress on the recommendations in the report should be provided to the committee not later than six months after the distribution date.

A P P E N D I C E S

I. RESPONSIBILITY MATRIX

II. CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE AND OPENING STATEMENTS

III. DISCUSSION SUMMARY-- LOCAL LEVIES

IV. DISCUSSION SUMMARY-- CAPITAL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

V. LIST OF REFERENCES

APPENDIX I

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
	Shall have general supervision and control over the state system.	*Shall operate all community colleges and voc-tech institutes in the district.*			
Operating Budget Actions	Review the budgets prepared by districts; prepare a single budget request for the system; submit the budget request to the Governor.		1. The district boards shall establish, adopt and regularly update an annual budget for district operations, just as the State Board develops a system budget.	Would not change current division of responsibilities. Would not change current practice either, unless accompanied by new format restrictions.	No implementation required. This recommendation is a confirmation of current practice.
			2. The State Board and district boards should resist line-items in operating budget appropriations and allocations by either the Legislature or the State Board.	No change in board responsibilities. The major thrust strategy in system budget requests will give way to program budgeting in future biennia.	The State Board, working with the WACC Operating Budget Committee and ultimately with the United Legislative Council, should adopt a set of conditions distinguishing acceptable line-item budget decisions from those that are unacceptable. This should be accomplished by January 1 of even-numbered years if it is to guide the development of the next biennial budget request.
			3. District efforts to gain operating budget support from the Legislature shall be made only through the system budget request process. The proposed system budget should identify the impact on each individual district at various support levels.	The concept confirms existing legislative strategy guidelines. No actual change in board responsibilities.	The State Board, working with the WACC Operating Budget Committee, should develop a set of groundrules and procedures for preliminary district-by-district allocations of each proposed appropriation for community college operating budget support. The procedure should be operational by fall 1976.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Operating Budget Actions (continued)			4. The State Board shall decide the system budget request and district allocations only after adequate advance notice to the districts and after providing an opportunity for interested districts to be heard. This notice procedure will ordinarily be through the WACC Operating Budget Committee. The minutes of the WACC Operating Budget Committee should be prepared and distributed to all presidents and chairpersons of district boards in order to provide for wider involvement in the budget building process.	Would accelerate the State Board timetable for development of the biennial budget request and the annual allocation process. Would increase the importance of district budget planning—particularly the kind of advance planning that would be necessary for a district to prepare a response to State Board inquiries. Would establish the role of the WACC Operating Budget Committee as a representative of district-level interest in the budget.	The state staff, with the advice of the WACC Operating Budget Committee, should provide for a district review/hearing period for interested districts prior to State Board adoption of budget requests and the district allocation process. This should be accomplished by March 31 of even-numbered years if it is to apply to the next biennial budget request and by March 31 of every year if it is to apply to district allocations. Distribution of WACC Operating Budget Committee minutes should be started immediately, under the direction of the committee chairman.
Capital Budget and Project Actions	Define and administer criteria and guidelines for the establishment of new community colleges or campuses. Establish and administer criteria and procedures for all capital construction, including the establishment, installation and expansion of facilities within the districts.	Establish new facilities with the approval of the State Board. Establish dormitories and other self-supporting facilities. Borrow money and issue and sell revenue bonds for certain kinds of construction.	5. The State Board should request that the capital appropriation be made by the Legislature in a lump-sum to the State Board for distribution among district projects according to internal system allocation rules. The State Board must provide the executive and legislative branches with evidence assuring	No change in statutory responsibilities within the system. Places new emphasis on the CAM and related pieces of the capital analysis process.	The State Board staff, with the Advice of the WACC Capital Budget Committee, should develop a proposal for a lump-sum capital appropriation and allocation procedure for 1977-79. The proposal should include recommendations for the legislative strategy necessary to secure its approval. The entire package should be presented to the United Legislative Council for recommendation to the State Board by March 1976.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Capital Budget and Project Actions (continued)	Sell or exchange and convey any or all interest in any community college real and personal property.		5. (continued) accountability at both the state and local levels.		
			6. The use of the Capital Analysis Model (CAM) in the capital budget development process must be modified to assure maximum local involvement.	No change in responsibilities. This recommendation calls for a change in the way the State Board's responsibility for the system budget request is implemented.	The state staff capital budget officer is now reviewing the capital budget development process with district vocational staff and system-wide task forces of the program users of facilities, i.e., student services, library. Those recommendations will then be taken to the WACC Capital Budget Committee. One of the things under consideration is the need for more district influence on the results of the Capital Analysis Model and of the entire capital budget development process. Recommendations should be presented to the State Board by February 1976.
			7. The State Board's internal system capital allocation should recognize campus master plans and priorities.	No apparent change in responsibilities, though the capital analysis process would more directly recognize campus master plans and priorities.	The State Board capital budget officer, with the advice of the WACC Capital Budget Committee, should develop recommendations for reflecting campus master plans and priorities in the capital budget development process.
			8. District efforts to gain capital budget support from the Legislature shall be made only through the system budget request process.	Confirms existing legislative strategy guidelines.	No implementation required. This recommendation confirms existing United Legislative Council procedures.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Personnel Actions, Including Professional Negotiations	Establish minimum standards with respect to qualifications and credentials of instructional and key administrative personnel. Assist the faculties of the community colleges and such other employees as the State Board may designate in the purchase of old-age annuities and retirement income plans under such rules and regulations as the State Board shall establish. Provide under such rules for the retirement of faculty and other employees because of age or health.	Employ faculty and administrative officers and other employees. Meet, confer and negotiate with recognized employee organizations. Adopt tenure rules and regulations. Adopt employee leave policies.	9. District boards should conduct local negotiations on salary and other negotiable items in accordance with legislative intent.	This change would appear to limit the application of the professional negotiations law.	The State Board should review its guidelines to see if the general principle of district negotiations in accordance with legislative intent is already clearly stated. If not, a new guideline should be drafted for State Board consideration by March 1976.
			10. The State Board shall determine legislative intent.	The State Board's responsibility for obtaining an interpretation of legislative intent would make it the single authoritative source of such an interpretation in the system.	No implementation required. This is the current practice.
			11. The task force endorses the concept of removing the State Board from the professional negotiations process, including impasse procedures.	Would significantly reduce the involvement of the State Board in professional negotiations.	The State Board supports current legislative proposals removing it from the professional negotiations process. Such legislation should be part of future legislative packages until it is approved by the Legislature.
			12. The State Board should not establish a statewide salary schedule. If it becomes necessary for the State Board to act in response to a district salary increase which is beyond what the State Board believes proper under the circumstances of a legislative appropriation the State Board	No change in existing responsibilities. Effect is to head-off a possible shift towards state-level salary administration.	The State Board staff should propose the process through which it will review district salary increases beyond those allowed by a legislative appropriation and by which it will assist in the elimination of excessive salary disparities. The provisions necessary to carry out this recommendation may be incorporated with those related to points 9 and 11 under this section.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Personnel Actions, Including Professional Negotiations (continued)			12. (continued) will act to protect the integrity of the legislative appropriation. The State Board has responsibility to assist in the elimination of excessive salary disparities.		
			13. It should be the responsibility of the Office of the Attorney General to resolve any differences among opinions rendered by Assistant Attorneys General.	This is the current practice.	No implementation required, as this is the current practice. The Chief of the Education Division of the Office of the Attorney General is the responsible person.
			14. The Office of the Attorney General should provide copies of all legal interpretations and a summary of pending legal issues to the State Board, and the State Board should distribute summaries of same to the districts.	No change in balance of responsibilities. Would increase the staff time required for the Office of the Attorney General to provide legal advice to the community colleges.	This routine has been established.
Real Property Acquisitions	To permit district boards to contract for construction, reconstruction, erection, equipping, maintenance, demolition and major alterations of buildings and other capital	Role (not statutory): To manage the real property of the district, submitting for State Board approval only those actions related to acquisition or disposal.	15. District boards shall hold title to all real and personal property received as gifts from private sources (and income from such gifts of real and personal property),	District boards will become the primary contact for purposes of gifts of real and personal property. The State Board's role will be limited to promoting and receiving gifts for the system as a whole.	This provision was included in the 1975 legislative program adopted by the United Legislative Council. It was not acted upon by the Legislature and should be a part of future legislative programs until it is adopted.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Real Property Acquisitions (continued)	assets, and the acquisition of sites, rights-of-way, easements, improvements or appurtenances of the college as approved by the State Board. Sell or exchange and convey any or all interest in any community college real or personal property.		15. (continued) consistent with the terms of the gift, and shall have authority to convey and sell it. If sold, proceeds from the sale of gifts of real property must be reappropriated by the Legislature in order to remain the property of the district board. Proceeds from the sale of gifts of personal property shall remain the property of the district.		
			16. Prior to acceptance of such gifts or benefits, the district board shall advise the State Board of the pending acquisition.	Minor change in board responsibilities in that district boards are not currently obligated to advise the State Board of pending gifts.	The State Board staff should draft a guideline for State Board action regarding the type and size of gifts that should be brought to the attention of the State Board. The proposed guideline should be presented to the State Board by fall 1976.
			17. The State Board shall not reduce support to a district because of gifts or their value.	This is a limitation on the general responsibility of the State Board to allocate appropriated funds to the districts.	The State Board staff should draft a guideline for State Board action related to the impact of gift revenue on capital and operating allocations. The guideline should spell out what action, if any, the State Board will take in the case of a district that receives substantial private funds for expenditures that would normally be covered by an allocation of state funds.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFLICT	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Real Property Acquisitions (continued)			18. The task force supports the efforts of the State Board to obtain authority to receive gifts on behalf of the system as a whole.	Would clarify legal authority for the State Board to continue seeking system-wide gifts.	This provision was included in the 1975 legislative program adopted by the United Legislative Council. It was not acted upon by the Legislature and should be a part of future legislative programs until enacted.
Program and Curriculum-Related Actions	Ensure that each district shall offer thoroughly comprehensive educational, training and service programs. Ensure that each community college shall maintain an open door policy, to the end that no student will be denied admission because of the location of his residence or because of his educational background or ability. Ensure that, insofar as is practical in the judgment of the State Board, curriculum offerings will be provided to meet the educational and training needs of the community and its students.	Create comprehensive programs and maintain an open door policy. Establish and maintain night schools. Prescribe, with the assistance of the faculty, the course of study in the various departments and colleges in the district. Grant non-baccalaureate degrees or certificates. Adopt rules for admissions and student conduct, including the conditions under which students can be dismissed. Avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities and programs.	19. To assure thoroughly comprehensive educational and training programs among districts of varying size, appropriate adjustments should be part of the rules for allocating operating resources to the districts. 20. District boards are supportive of community service courses and expect the State Board to make every effort to secure funding for them. 21. District program staffing levels shall be the responsibility of the districts.	No change in responsibilities. This recommendation, as written, would require additional funds from the Legislature for implementation. No change in responsibilities. Encourages the State Board to seek state-level funding; leaves program decisions to the district boards. No change in responsibilities. Discourages prescription of district staffing levels through the allocation of funds.	The state staff, working with system constituencies, should develop recommendations for incorporating a resource-guiding definition of "comprehensiveness" into the formulas and the program budgeting process. This item is a part of the 1977-79 program budget development project. The State Board should continue to emphasize state funding for community service offerings in system budget proposals to OPPFM and to the Legislature at every opportunity. The state staff, with the advice of WACC and TACC, should develop statutory proposals that will protect district board responsibilities for program staffing decisions and present them to the United Legislative Council by September 1976.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Program and Curriculum-Related Actions (continued)	Avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities and programs. Ensure that all students will be considered equally as members of the student body. Establish minimum standards with respect to content of curriculum and other educational and training programs and of the requirements, degrees and diplomas awarded by the colleges. Establish minimum standards for admissions policies. Encourage innovation in the development of new educational and training programs and instructional methods; coordinate research and disseminate the findings thereof. Authorize the various colleges to offer programs in other districts.		22. The State Board has responsibility for supervising and enforcing enrollment counting criteria for budget purposes. 23. The State Board shall have responsibility to review course coding and credit-hours assigned to courses and to recommend the changes necessary to establish minimum uniformity among districts. 24. The task force subscribes to the consortium concept as presented in the "multi-district cooperation" section of this report.	No change in current practice. Activation of a latent State Board responsibility at the request of WACC and this task force. No change in responsibilities.	No implementation required, as this is the current practice. The State Board staff has established a representative task force to recommend the course coding and credit-hour assignment changes necessary. Initial recommendations of the task force are to be ready by the end of 1975-76. No implementation required.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Planning	Prepare a comprehensive master plan. Assist OPPFM in the preparation of enrollment projections to support plans for providing adequate community college facilities in all areas of the state.	Role (not statutory): To establish appropriate local procedures for curriculum, facility, budget and program planning and to participate in statewide comprehensive program and enrollment planning.	25. State and district boards should jointly develop the program planning techniques necessary to meet the requirements of the program budget request process that will commence with the 1977-79 biennium.	Would introduce a program planning and budgeting emphasis into the existing balance of State Board/district board responsibilities for planning and budgeting.	The state staff, with the advice of the WACC Operating Budget Committee, is developing a plan for implementing a program budget request, allocation and performance evaluation process for the 1977-79 biennium. The plan will be discussed with the districts in late 1975 and early 1976 so that district budget development for 1977-79 can be completed before fall 1976.
			26. The State Board should coordinate the development of efficiency and effectiveness measures with widespread system input from faculty and administrators and in consultation with third-party agencies.	Specifies that standards of efficiency and effectiveness will be a part of the State Board's responsibility to prepare a system budget request.	In connection with the 1977-79 budget project, the program standards development project should be clearly and carefully laid-out by the state staff, including definitions of "efficiency" and "effectiveness" and a description of how all concerned elements of the system will be involved in deciding how to approach these legislative requirements. This item is expected to draw the most attention during district review of the 1977-79 budget plan.
			27. The state and district boards must constantly affirm their belief in the open door concept and seek the funding support necessary to sustain it. The State Board is responsible for presenting an enrollment	No change in responsibilities. This recommendation describes and clarifies the roles of the State Board and local boards in the enrollment planning process.	No implementation required. This is the current practice.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
			plan to the Governor and the Legislature that, if accepted, would sustain the open door. The State Board is also responsible for establishing district-by-district enrollment plans that recognize and protect (to the extent possible within the terms of a given appropriation) the program differences and per-student cost differences that exist among the districts. The district board's responsibility is to adopt admissions and enrollment policies that achieve the best balance between growth and program that is possible within a given budget.		
			28. State Board planning procedures should provide for involvement of district personnel. District planning which cuts across district boundaries should be shared with the State Board.	Would increase the importance and visibility of a concept that is already a part of state and district planning deliberations.	The plan for implementing a 1977-79 program budget should clearly provide for the involvement of district personnel in the various tasks related to the 1977-79 budget. Among other things, the project should allow time for district board review of major planning results prior to the time

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Planning (continued)					they are incorporated into the budget request. This provision should be a visible part of the plan to be reviewed with the districts in early 1976.
Fees and Charges	Role (not statutory): To establish guidelines relating to uniform charges among the districts for the various tuition and fee categories.	Adopt fee schedules.	29. The authority to set fee schedules belongs exclusively to the local boards; however, the State Board should establish guidelines encouraging uniform charges among the districts for the various tuition and fee categories.	Would formalize an established role of the State Board.	The state staff should review all fee practices to determine if additional fee guidelines are needed. Staff recommendations should be presented for system review by April 1976, for State Board action prior to June 30, 1976, and for application beginning with the 1977-79 biennium.
			30. Guidelines, rules and regulations should be defined as three separate and distinct categories of State Board actions so that they can be accurately interpreted and implemented by district boards.	No change in responsibilities.	The state staff should develop working definitions for guidelines, rules and regulations and present them for State Board review and discussion by June 1976.
			31. State and district community college boards should have the authority to communicate with the Legislature.	Would remove some restrictions on both boards as they fulfill their responsibilities for legislative liaison.	This provision was included in the 1975 legislative program adopted by the United Legislative Council. It was not acted upon by the Legislature and should be a part of future legislative programs until it is adopted.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Legislative Program (continued)			32. The task force endorses the concept of a United Legislative Council.	No change in responsibilities.	No implementation required.
			33. The United Legislative Council should continue to develop a representative legislative program for community colleges.	No change in responsibilities.	No implementation required.
State Agency Status	Role (not statutory): To interpret legislative and executive requirements and take the necessary steps to assure community college compliance.	Role (probably backed up by general provisions in the law regarding responsibilities associated with state agency status): To implement all requirements associated with state agency status.	34. The state office should (a) determine the cost of those reporting requirements associated with state agency status and (b) request and allocate funds to reimburse the districts for the costs.	Encourages an aggressive role for the State Board in the management of third-party reporting requirements.	The state office should develop a study of other state agency reporting requirements and their costs to be included as a special item in the 1977-79 budget request. The study should be completed by June 1976 so that it can be part of the 1977-79 budget request.
			35. All data requests from agencies such as CPE, OPPPM and the Legislature should be channeled through the state office.	Conforms with practice currently preferred by state and district boards.	No implementation required. A reminder to the districts to route all third-party data requests to the state office might be useful.
Multi-District Cooperation	Role (not statutory): To promote multi-campus arrangements for the delivery of educational and support services.		36. The task force does not favor establishment of regional boards.	No change in responsibilities.	No implementation required.

AREAS OF STRESS, CONFUSION	BOARD STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES		TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES	STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
	STATE BOARD	DISTRICT BOARDS			
Multi-District Cooperation (continued)			37. The State Board should encourage the establishment of consortia in order to promote economies, promote specialized programs and services for students, and avoid duplication. Districts should keep the State Board advised of existing and proposed consortia efforts.	Encourages an active role for the State Board in encouraging consortium approaches.	A state staff paper on consortia and their status in the system and their value in the future would serve to draw attention to such multi-district arrangements. The same arrangement would serve to keep the State Board advised of other consortia efforts. Such a paper should be written with the advice of those responsible for consortia efforts and should be presented to the State Board for distribution to the system.

APPENDIX II

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE AND OPENING STATEMENTS

In a statement issued on March 14, 1974, Mr. Andrew J. Young, Chairman of the State Board for Community College Education, called for the formation of a task force to review the role of the State Board and of local boards so that the expectations for each may be realized through the effective delivery of educational services in an efficient manner through the community colleges.

He noted that since the Community College Act was passed in 1967, there have been very few changes in the law and no significant changes in the relationship between local districts and the State Board. The balance achieved in the legislation has been quite effective. Nevertheless, there are certain stresses and there are areas of confusion as to roles. This became evident during the Community College Governance Symposium held in Seattle on February 15-16, 1974. Following that meeting, the State Director requested State Board guidance and assistance in resolving the confusion. The result of the Board's guidance is this task force. This seems to be a promising moment to review the 1967 Community College Act as it relates to roles.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY - LOCAL LEVIES

Dr. Ray Needham, President of Linn-Benton Community College in Oregon, appeared as a resource person to comment on the situation in Oregon. Oregon community colleges depend upon local community support for about 40 percent of their budget. Twenty percent of it comes from tuition, and the remaining 40 percent comes from the state. They have no enrollment limitation--the funding formula for the state's 40 percent applies to whatever enrollments the district achieves.

The primary governing body for community colleges in Oregon is a local board comprised of elected trustees. The State Board of Education allocates state funds to the colleges, but does so through a very limited staff. Their primary involvement with local colleges is related to administration of the federal vocational plan.

In Oregon, local levies require no minimum voter turn-out, can be passed by a simple majority, and are scheduled on a common calendar that applies to all districts. The law requires that a local levy proposal be first approved by a citizen budget committee made up of lay members selected by the local board of trustees.

It was Dr. Needham's conclusion that he would rather face the difficulty of selling levies to his community than face the uncertainties of limited state funding and program opportunities. In his experience, which included a term as dean of instruction at Green River Community College, dedication and accountability to the community are more readily accepted as a part of each staff member's job when 40 percent of the budget depends upon community support.

Dr. Needham felt that the role of district boards in the State of Washington would be enhanced if we would work toward elected board members, a sharing of responsibilities with the State Board, and local funding.

There was some discussion of the history of state funding for Washington community colleges. Dr. Story pointed out that the 1967 law separated community colleges from the school districts, not out of a need to limit local autonomy, but out of a need for a different local governance structure than had previously existed. It was the decision to go to state funding that led to state agency status and most of the limitations we now face. The Arthur D. Little report, which was the basis for legislative action, recommended that local community college districts have taxing authority and that trustees be elected.

Dr. Ray Schultz, Professor of Community College Education at Washington State University, presented the following comments on the subject of local funding--reflecting his view that it would be unwise to move away from full state funding for community colleges.

Factors contributing to the community college funding crisis in the State of Washington

First, our tax base is not large enough to adequately support all state services. The Legislature is reluctant to change or increase the tax base because of recent public opposition to tax

reform proposals. Second, the Legislature in this state has the prerogative of funding at less than 100 percent of formula. In Florida, the Legislature modifies the formula but then funds the modified formula at 100 percent.

Third, the Legislature's decision to withdraw support from community service offerings has made it difficult for the community colleges to provide enough community offerings to adequately serve the community.

Fourth, the statutory requirement that 60 percent of tuition revenue be earmarked for bond retirement significantly limits local funding options.

A Case for full state funding of community colleges

People in all parts of the state should be entitled to have access to a community college educational program. While this can be accomplished with partial state funding and an equalization formula, full state funding is preferable.

When community colleges are funded from local sources (such as levies) they are in direct competition with local school districts. This leads to strained relationships among local educators and makes it difficult for community colleges to pass their levies. Local levies require much staff time for the development and promotion of the ballot issue.

Finally, property taxes are already heavily used for local services, so it is not the local tax with the most growth potential.

Difficulties in moving back towards local funding once state funding has been authorized

There are difficult political realities involved here. The decision regarding what constitutes a taxing district may lead to changed district boundaries--an unsettling action at best to the local districts. Also, there is a standard concern about difficulty in passing local levies--especially a new one. Finally, the Legislature might use the re-establishment of local support as an excuse to cut state support. To be an effective source of revenue, the establishment of a local tax must be accompanied by a halt in steadily declining state support levels.

A Proposal

Dr. Schultz suggested that we might ask for authorization for a one-mill special levy with the decision to levy it permissive to the local board, i.e., the local board would be the taxing agent. The levy proceeds should be limited to enrichment above a supposedly full state-funded program or limited to the support of community service course offerings.

In response to questions from members of the task force, Dr. Schultz made the following additional comments:

--A third possibility for use of local levy proceeds would be to support facility needs (such as gymnasiums or auditoriums) that are not usually recommended for state funding.

--Florida shifted from a local/state funding basis to 100 percent state funding at a time when local funding was a small percent of the total. That may have made the transition easier. The rationale for the Florida action was to equalize the effects of different levels of local income on educational opportunities in different parts of the state.

--The level of state control did not change much in Florida. The state office had been a service agency and distributor of state funds before the change. The shift in funding base has not changed the orientation of the state staff, and the number of people on the staff has increased only from two to six.

--Virginia is the most centralized system in the country with a state staff of 100. They rely on local advisory boards rather than local boards of trustees. The State Board hires the campus presidents. Sensitivity to local needs is a responsibility of the campus president through his advisory board.

--The definition of taxing districts would be simple if existing district boundaries could be used, but that would probably result in uneven total assessments.

--In Florida, state support continued to increase after the shift. In that state, it seemed that educational services were more responsible for local identity than was the source of funds.

--In Florida, trustees are appointed by the Governor, but are nominated by local school board members. That is not a recommendation for how it should be in this state.

--There is a role for local boards, even in the absence of a local taxing base. In both Washington and Florida, they play a role in maintaining a sensitivity to local needs, they are involved in personnel selection and negotiations, and are involved in the budget process, subject in part to requirements established by the Legislature.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY - CAPITAL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The main issue addressed in connection with capital budget and project actions was what was a perceived lack of involvement of the districts in the priority and other decisions involved in presenting the system capital budget request to the Legislature. Trustee members felt that, while the local boards had input to the Capital Analysis Model, the assumptions and conditions of the CAM determined the final recommendations to the Legislature.

All felt a need for uniform rules to assure equitable allocation of resources among districts. But most also felt that districts need more flexibility in the exact projects to which the resources will be committed. The CAM process was seen as one extreme; a local capital levy process was seen as the other. The group then looked for some choices in the middle. The three options identified were:

1. Some process to allow the districts to have a local capital levy option, with the proceeds of a successful levy to be charged against the CAM entitlement for the district.

2. A set of decision rules that determines an annual capital dollar allowance for each district, leaving it to the district to decide how long to accumulate its allowance and to what type and size of capital project to commit it.

3. The present CAM process, with improvements to increase the impact of district recommendations and priorities.

Bill Julius of the State Board staff then presented his analysis of the three options for discussion by the group.

RESPONSE TO THE CAPITAL BUDGET PROPOSALS OF THE TASK FORCE ON BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

Proposal No. 1--To allow each district a local capital levy option with the proceeds of a successful levy being charged against the CAM entitlement for the district.

This proposal would allow each community college district to attempt to pass a special levy to pay for specific capital improvements in the district.

PRO'S

Such an authority, if granted by a change in the community college act, would allow the local board of trustees to overcome state-level reluctance or inability to fund capital facilities that are deemed by the local board to be necessary and of high priority. This could prevent the long waits that now face many districts for new or augmented facilities of types that have traditionally been accorded low priority by the executive and legislative branches and/or by the State Board. Upon completion of such locally-funded facilities, the new space would become part of the college's inventory of facilities and would thereby diminish the CAM entitlement for that type of space in future capital budget requests for state funds.

CON'S

a. The state system was created, in part at least, to provide equal and adequate funding for operating and capital requirements of all community colleges by avoiding dependence on local levies and on the resultant varying "ability to pay" of the property tax base in different parts of the state. To allow some colleges through use of local funding to acquire facilities that would be impossible for other colleges to get would be to lose the equity which is essential to the present concept of the community college system.

b. It is very likely that a legislative change in the community college act to authorize local levies for capital construction would be accompanied by a list of types of space that must be so funded. Physical education, dining, student activity and similar types of space might well be foreclosed from state funding altogether, forcing districts in need of such space to either be successful in a local levy or to continue to do without the facility. (With the apparent loss of community college tuition revenues for capital purposes through the stated unwillingness of the State Finance Committee to recommend tuition bond sales, the Governor's budget agency and the Legislature are now faced with the necessity either to fund the "low priority" types of space from regular capital fund sources or to deny the need for such facilities altogether. We believe this situation should lead to the endorsement by OPPFM of the position long held by the State Board--that the state should provide all capital facilities needed for reasonable campus operation, including dining and similar student-related facilities. On the other hand, granting a local levy authority would let the state "off the hook" on the issue of providing all necessary types of facilities.)

c. Establishment of two groups of types of facilities--state-funded and locally funded--would likely encourage the conversion of existing space from one group to the other in order to maximize or minimize the use and impact of the local levy. Such space conversions might not be adequately funded themselves. The conversions might also be simply expedient rather than the honest reflection of long-range needs or to enhance the functional relationships of on-campus spaces and activities.

d. The geographic areas of the state's community college districts have widely varying degrees of homogeneity and the inhabitants of the districts have more or less perceptiveness of the local college as being "theirs." A local levy authority would be much more effective in the more cohesive districts; by the same token, colleges in very large or diverse districts would be at an absolute and relative disadvantage in acquiring capital funding.

e. Where a community college district is larger than a single commuting shed, there is reasonable doubt as to the amount of service rendered to citizens in one part of the district by a campus located in another widely-separated area. Districts 14, 15, 17 and 20 are major examples of such situations. Such doubt would reduce the acceptability of the local levy.

f. Local property taxes are already sufficiently burdened with existing requirements to support other elements of education and public services. It could be difficult to generate executive and legislative support for this additional local tax.

PROPOSAL NO. 2--To establish decision rules for determining an annual capital dollar allowance for each district, leaving it to each district to decide when and how to spend its allowance.

PRO'S

a. Depending on the decision rules, the local board could make virtually autonomous choices about what capital facilities to construct or improve, thereby coming as close to meeting locally-perceived needs as is financially possible.

b. The preparation and documentation of community college system capital budget requests could reflect the decision-rule data only, rather than the detailed project plans now required. This would eliminate spurious specificity in early capital project planning.

CON'S

a. The CAM has established an expectation on the part of OPPFM, CHE and the Legislature that specific space needs for each project can be identified and are the basis for requesting funds that will be used to meet those needs. In the era of accountability, it is difficult to imagine a reduction of those expectations.

b. The four-year schools have developed an equivalent to the CAM. OPPFM has requested a reconciliation or substantiation of the differences between the two higher education space-entitlement models. The community college system, therefore, no longer has the option to retreat into "model-less" conformity with the rest of public higher education.

c. There is no reason to believe that the Legislature, in the near future, will be willing to appropriate non-earmarked funds to the community college system for unidentified capital projects. Even earmarked sources such as tuition bonding and Referendum 31 monies have heretofore been specifically required to be "line-item" appropriations.

c. Because each campus has a different level of adequacy of its present space, vis-a-vis, its present or anticipated enrollment, each campus has a different level of need for capital funds to achieve an equitable and adequate physical plant. No presumption of equity between campuses could be made once capital expenditure decisions were based solely on local views of priorities. If equity of educational opportunity for all state residents is to continue to be a consideration, some uniformity of educational facility development must continue. If equity of physical plant resources is not to be an objective of the community college system, clear legislative and gubernatorial understanding and approval of the proposed alternative to such equity must be gained before any state capital resources could be expected to be appropriated.

PROPOSAL NO. 3--Improvements in the CAM to increase the role of the local boards in the final capital budget request of the system.

There is no question as to the desirability of an increased role for the local boards in the preparation of the system capital request. As the responsible agency, however, the State Board has been questioned about two major aspects of the capital budget proposals: the size and type of projects, and the priority of projects. Present procedures are aimed at dealing satisfactorily with both issues.

Priority. The most recent capital budget action included a detailed analysis of local and state priorities. Local board priorities were used as one of two primary determinants of the system priority sequence. The second determinant was a State Board expression of concern that projects involving upgrade of existing facilities take precedence over facilities proposed to house growth or new programs. These two determinants were woven into a state-level prioritizing scheme that established a #1 through #99 sequence for all new projects.

For all other projects (those from 1974, Referendum 31, from WISHA, etc.) the system priority sequence was adopted exactly as recommended by the Capital Budget Committee of WACC. It has been the objective of the State Board staff to use as much system guidance as possible in developing the priority decision rules and in validating the actual priority sequences as determined by those rules.

It is the position of the State Board that educational priority decisions are properly the responsibility of the community college system. The Governor requests and receives a prioritized capital budget proposal from the system. Therefore, so long as the projects are accepted as necessary and justified, the priority sequence should stand as submitted and the sole question to be answered by the executive and legislative branches should be: how much money can be spent? The level of funds available, measured against the prioritized sequence of projects, should determine the projects for which funds are appropriated.

Project justification. The equitable distribution of state or community college system resources for capital improvements has made it imperative to develop a device for measuring capital needs objectively. The CAM is such a device. The CAM does not determine priorities; it merely measures the need for each type of space on each campus, based on an assumed level of enrollment and on space-per-student guidelines. The CAM was used first by the State Board to evaluate local project requests. The CAM has now been accepted by OPPFM and the Governor as the means of validating the need for a given space on a given campus.

As presently constituted, the CAM can give only a single answer about the need for a given type of space on a given campus, regardless of unique program requirements or normal program differences between campuses. At present, the CAM space-per-student factors are quite restrictive, stemming from the period prior to 1975 when capital resources were earmarked (hence, "fixed"), and the objective was to get as many needed facilities for as many campuses as possible from the fixed level of available funds.

Now, however, the community college system has no effective call on any earmarked funds. The system is competing for general state funds, probably based on the general obligation bonding capacity of the Legislature authorized in 1972 by the voters in approving HJR 52. There is, therefore, no pre-determined limit to the amount of funds that can reasonably be requested by the system for justifiable community college capital needs. In light of this situation, the increasing number of more liberal sets of guidelines from other states, and the more generous space factors being proposed by the state's public four-year institutions, the state staff proposes to review and modify the entire set of CAM guidelines during the 1974-75 school year. This process will accomplish several things:

a. To review and reconcile the community college and four-year standards, as has been requested by OPPFM;

b. To review and modify as needed the space-per-student factors, based on the perception of the system as to their adequacy and based on corroborating evidence from similar standards in other states; and,

c. To review the rationale on which the CAM is based, including (1) provision for evening use of campus facilities, and (2) ability to differentiate space needs by local program mix and emphasis, e.g., music, art, drama.

Discussion of the Proposals

While the intention of Proposal No. 1 would be that a district would lose only its entitlement to the project that was locally-funded, i.e., would not lose its entitlement to other projects on its priority list, some felt that such a rule might not hold from biennium to biennium. Even if local districts restricted use of local levies to projects too low on the state priority list to qualify for state funding, it would be hard for the Legislature to ignore such a source of local funds in this time of short revenue and high demand for capital projects.

If the Legislature did discount state appropriations by the amount of any local levy for capital construction, then Proposal No. 1 would not increase the capital resources available to the districts and would not be a viable option. Given the difficulty of selling local levies, and the possibility of a legislative discount if it was sold, the group concluded that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages for Proposal No. 1.

Proposal No. 2 requires a major new source of capital funds. While current tuition cash flow might fund the basic requirements of such a proposal, such cash flow would be available only if the Legislature authorized us to refund our outstanding tuition bonds--an unlikely event in a time of limited general revenue. Even if the Legislature did that, they would probably then capture our tuition deposits for the general fund.

While implementation of Proposal No. 2 has some serious obstacles, the idea of more district influence on the final capital budget request was considered to be an important recommendation on capital budget and project actions.

With regard to Proposal No. 3, the state staff argued that the CAM is only part of the community college capital budget development process--the part that introduces space-per-student factors in the final prioritization of projects.

The group raised some questions about why capital project priorities were needed, since the Legislature felt free to depart from them anayway. The staff responded that project-by-project priorities are one of the key elements in the OPPFM and legislative budget requirements.

The space-per-student guidelines were described by the state staff as conservative. Any update will certainly liberalize them. Any liberalization would probably mean fewer community college projects, rather than a bigger share of statewide capital funds for the community college system.

The task force discussed at length the apparent inflexibility of the CAM and ways to increase the role of local districts in capital decisions. The state staff pointed out that much of the assumed flexibility of the capital budget systems lies in the emphasis that is placed on the CAM in presentations to the Governor and the Legislature. The CAM is accepted by the political decision-makers. In the view of the Governor and budget-oriented legislators, local capital project flexibility is a way of circumventing executive and legislative intent. So, the considerable local flexibility allowed by the community college capital process must be reconciled to executive and legislative demands for accountability.

A key point in the task force's discussion of these options was the possibility of using the CAM to determine a broad space allowance as called for by Proposal No. 2, resulting in a lump-sum capital request based on CAM-determined local space needs.

Most members of the task force felt they could live with a CAM process so long as it was internal to the system. In other words, a lump-sum appropriation to the State Board allocated to the districts based on an agreed-upon set of decision rules, something like the existing capital budget process.

However, the Legislature is not likely to appropriate a lump-sum amount without knowing how the system intends to spend it. This means that the process of developing a request would be very similar to the process we now follow. The main area of flexibility would be in how far we could depart from the capital plan used to defend our request, when the time comes to actually implement projects.

Most members of the task force indicated they were deeply concerned about the number of other agencies involved in reviewing our priorities--agencies whose staff have more authority and influence over our request than we would ever vest in a person of similar experience in our own system.

Finally, the group discussed the Program Evaluator Guide (PEG) which provides the cost-per-square-foot standards for the capital budget request system. The main issue was with the assumption that the cost-per-square-foot allowed for a new project on a campus will reflect the current design standards present on the campus for other buildings. This means that a campus can upgrade its design only through the quality they can build into new capital projects. And they can only do that by sacrificing square feet in order to raise the square foot cost and establish a new design level from which later projects will benefit.

Most members of the task force felt that provisions for improving the quality of space should be built into the cost analysis part of the capital budget request system. It seemed self-defeating to request no improvement in space just because we have not received money for it in the past. Instead, we should find ways to ask for the money ... and make a case for improved quality in the process of doing so.

APPENDIX V

REFERENCES

Copies of these materials are available on loan by contacting Roger Bassett, State Board for Community College Education, 319 Seventh Avenue, Olympia, Washington (98504), telephone: SCAN 234-3675 or Non-SCAN (206) 753-3675.

General

1. Correspondence and staff papers:

   a. "Regional Meetings of State Board Members and Members of District Boards of Trustees," a memorandum from L. Evert Landon, Chairman, to members of the State Board, November 5, 1969.

   b. "State Staff Management Plan (1973-75)," a memorandum from John C. Mundt, State Director, to the WACC Executive Committee, January 7, 1974.

   c. "WACC Perceptions and SBCCE Management Practices," a paper with the results of a questionnaire to WACC members with discussion compiled by Dr. David B. Story, President of WACC, March 1974 (date approximate).

   d. "Summary of State Board Actions in 1973-74," compiled by Roger Bassett for the Task Force on Board Relationships, July 11, 1974.

   e. "Shoreline Community College ... Summary of District Board Decisions Considered During July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974," presented to the Task Force on Board Relationships by Mr. Robert Leonard, Trustee, Shoreline Community College (District #7), July 11, 1974.

   f. "Summary and Analysis of District No. 8 (Bellevue Community College) Board Decisions, July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974," presented to the Task Force on Board Relationships by Mr. C.W. "Pat" Duffy, July 11, 1974.

   g. "Summary of State-level/District-level Responsibilities in Other States," compiled by John C. Mundt for the Task Force on Board Relationships, July 11, 1974.

   h. "Management of the Community College System: A Synopsis," a chronological summary of the key activities of the State Board between 1968 and 1974, compiled by Dr. Gilbert J. Carbone, Assistant Director, State Board for Community College Education, January 1974 (date approximate).

   i. Letter to Representative John Bagnariol from Andrew J. Young, Chairman, SBCCE, reporting the status of the work of the Task Force on Board Relationships, March 4, 1975.

   j. Letter to Representative John Bagnariol from Pinckney Rohrback, Trustee, Shoreline Community College (District #7), referring to Representative Bagnariol's interest in the proceedings of the Task Force on Board Relationships.

2. Other background materials:

   a. Chapter 28B.50, RCW--Community College Act of 1967 (and Community Colleges Generally).

b. Senate Resolution No. 1974-271, by Senators Sandison, Marsh, Donohue, Scott, Metcalf and Odegaard, calling, among other things, for a study of state and local board roles, adopted April 24, 1974.

c. "Governance in Higher Education: A Bibliography," Dr. Edward Command, a staff report done for the State Board staff, 1970.

d. "Accountability in Higher Education," edited by Winifred Thompson, in the Management Forum, a publication of the Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development. Vol. 3, No. 4, April 1974.

e. "California Views Toward Statewide Governance of Community Colleges," by Sidney W. Brossman, a publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership (Florida State University/University of Florida), Tallahassee, Florida, September 1973.

f. "Community Colleges: The Growing Influence of the State," Change, June 1974, by Arthur M. Cohen.

g. "Pathologies of Participation," by Harold C. Martin in AGB Reports, May/June 1974.

h. "State-level Planning for Community Colleges: Are the 1202 Commissions a Contripetal or Centrifugal Force in Post-Secondary Education," by S.V. Martorano, Penn State University Center for the Study of Higher Education, published January 1974 by the American College Testing Program.

i. "The Board of Trustees and the Making of Academic Policy," Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 3, No. 2: 3/6, April 1974, published by the Society for College and University Planning in cooperation with Educational Facilities Laboratories.

j. "The New Managers on Campus," a special report of the Chronical for Higher Education, date unknown.

k. "The Organization and Internal Operation of Selected State Agencies in State Operated Systems of Public Community-Junior Colleges," by Michael A. DeCarlo, a dissertation submitted in fulfillment of a Ph.D. degree, Florida State University, 1973.

l. "The Trustee and Public Expectations," AGB Reports, Vol. 16, No. 1, September 1973.

Operating Budget Actions

1. Correspondence and staff papers:

a. "WACC Questionnaire," a summary of the results of a questionnaire to the presidents on the subject of State Board/local board relationships and local funding, compiled by Dr. David B. Story for the members of the Task Force on Board Relationships, October 7, 1974.

b. An extract of the Oregon State budget request for 1975-77, showing budget and cost data for Oregon community colleges.

c. "Three Options for Increased Local Responsibility and Accountability," a staff paper for the Task Force on Board Relationships by Roger Bassett, SBCCE staff, November 13, 1974.

d. "Final Report on Community College Capital Construction in Compliance with House Resolution No. 6999 and Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the Forty-First Legislature," dated October 17, 1969. A summary of capital budget procedures and possible alternate sources of funds.

e. Two draft legislative resolutions by Dr. David B. Story, President, Lower Columbia College, January 15, 1975. One directs a study of the election of local trustees and the other directs a study of ways to authorize local capital and operating fund sources.

2. Other background materials:

a. "State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges," by Lawrence H. Arney, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainsville, Florida, dated February 1970.

b. "Statewide Average Percentages of Financial Support for Current Operating Expenses: Public Community/Junior Colleges, 1973-74," from Financial Support for Community Colleges, 1974, by James L. Wattenbarger and Paul M. Starnes, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainsville, Florida, June 1974.

Capital Budget and Project Actions

1. May 24, 1974 memorandum from Bill Julius, State Board Capital Budget Officer, to district and campus presidents, subject: "Capital Budget Materials for Your Review."

2. Schematic description of the capital budget development process, including the Capital Analysis Model (CAM) and Project Evaluator Guide (PEG), compiled by Bill Julius for the Task Force on Board Relationships, September 4, 1974.

3. Memorandum to Task Force members from Dr. David B. Story, President, Lower Columbia College, September 16, 1974, subject: "Lump-Sum Capital Allocation Arguments."

Personnel Actions, Including Professional Negotiations

"A Statewide Salary Schedule"--A rationale in favor of a statewide salary schedule by Dr. Nels Hanson, President, Community College District No. 12 (Centralia/OVTI).

Program and Curriculum-Related Actions

1. A letter from Roger Bassett, SBCCE staff, to Mr. Louis Soriano, dated February 10, 1975, answering Mr. Soriano's questions about policies on the establishment of admissions standards and authority for a district to offer programs within the boundaries of another.

2. "Evaluating and Terminating Existing Instructional Programs: The Controversial Role of Statewide Coordinating/Governing Agencies," by Elizabeth H. Johnson, Member, Board of Higher Education in Oregon, March 24, 1974.

Planning

Foreward to the Performance Audit of the Community College Enrollment Projection Methodology, by the Legislative Budget Committee, Olympia, Washington, June 22, 1974.

Student Fees

"Services and Activities Fee State Board Guidelines," a memorandum from Richard M. Montecucco, Assistant Attorney General, to John C. Mundt, State Director, dated August 31, 1974.

Legislative Program

"Legislative Contact Program," a memorandum from John C. Mundt, State Director, to members of the Task Force on Board Relationships, dated October 31, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 19 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES